

MINUTES/ACTIONS

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Also Meeting As
STATE BOARD FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Ladislaus B. Dombrowski Board Room
John A. Hannah Building
608 West Allegan
Lansing, Michigan

March 16, 2000
9:00 a.m.

Present: Mr. Arthur E. Ellis, Chairman
Mrs. Dorothy Beardmore, President
Mrs. Kathleen N. Straus, Vice President
Dr. Herbert S. Moyer, Secretary
Mrs. Sharon A. Wise, Treasurer
Mrs. Sharon L. Gire, NASBE Delegate
Mrs. Marianne Yared McGuire
Mr. Michael David Warren, Jr.
Mrs. Eileen L. Weiser
Mr. Scott Jenkins, representing Governor John Engler, ex officio

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Ellis called the meeting to order at 9:36 a.m.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND ORDER OF PRIORITY

A. Report of the Superintendent - Reading Improvement Assistance Grant -
added to agenda

Mrs. Straus moved, seconded by Mrs. Weiser, that the State Board of Education approve the agenda and order of priority, as modified.

The vote was taken on the motion.

Ayes: Beardmore, Gire, McGuire, Moyer, Straus, Warren, Weiser, Wise

The motion carried.

Dr. Moyer said March has been designated Parenting Awareness Month, and he has asked staff to draft a resolution recognizing the importance of parental involvement with their child's education.

There was consensus to add the resolution to the agenda for adoption later in the meeting.

III. INFORMATIONAL MATERIALS DISTRIBUTED TO THE BOARD

- A. Memorandum dated March 16, 2000, from Alexander G. Davlantes, Administrative Officer, to the State Board of Education regarding Update on Activities at Michigan Schools for the Deaf and Blind and Camp T
- B. Memorandum dated March 16, 2000, from Mr. Ellis to the Board regarding Information on the 1998-99 Dual Enrollment Data
- C. Memorandum dated March 16, 2000, from Mr. Ellis to the Board regarding Information on Ave Maria School of Law
- D. Memorandum dated March 16, 2000, from Mr. Ellis to the Board regarding Information on "Evaluation of Goals 2000 Projects Awarded in 1997-98"

IV. INTRODUCTION OF STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEMBERS AND GUESTS

Mrs. Eileen Hamilton, Administrative Secretary to the State Board of Education, introduced the members of the Board and guests attending the meeting.

V. APPROVAL OF STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MINUTES

Mr. Warren expressed concern that Exhibit A mentioned on Page 4 of the February 17, 2000 minutes had been inadvertently omitted. He said he feels that if the Board is to approve the minutes, it is necessary that the Exhibit be provided.

A copy of Exhibit A "A Working Draft for the Selection Criteria for Superintendent of Public Instruction" was distributed to the Board.

Mr. Warren said the minutes state that "changes as a result of the Committee of the Whole discussion are indicated in bold print" on the working draft as if the Board had taken a vote and finalized the document. He said even though Exhibit A is stipulated as a working draft, he wanted to be sure that the Board was comfortable with the document.

Mrs. Beardmore said the working draft is a compilation of some of the points made during the Committee of the Whole meeting, and the bolded sections were added by consensus of the Board. She said no vote was taken during the Committee of the Whole meeting, or during the regular meeting that day.

Mrs. Eileen Hamilton, Administrative Secretary to the State Board of Education, said the Board did not discuss the entire document, as indicated on page 4, of the February 17, 2000 minutes.

Mrs. Beardmore and Mrs. Wise said they feel the minutes provided to the Board were clear regarding the Committee of the Whole meeting and the selection criteria for the superintendent of public instruction.

Mr. Warren asked if it was normal procedure to not include much detail regarding Committee of the Whole discussions. In response, Mrs. Hamilton said minutes are not prepared for Committee of the Whole meetings. The record is simply a list of topic(s) discussed.

Mr. Warren pointed out that Mrs. Wise's name was incomplete on the motion at the top of Page 20.

Mrs. Hamilton said it appears that the corner of the page was folded down during photocopying.

Mrs. Wise moved, seconded by Mr. Warren, that the State Board of Education approve the minutes/actions of February 17, 2000, with Exhibit A.

Ayes: Beardmore, Gire, McGuire, Moyer, Straus, Warren, Weiser, Wise

The motion carried.

VI. PERSONAL PRIVILEGE - MRS. KATHLEEN STRAUS

Mrs. Straus said the Detroit Urban League will be hosting a banquet and giving her an award later in the day, and therefore, it would be necessary for her to leave at 12:30 p.m.

Mr. Ellis said there was an article in The Detroit News, and a short segment recently on WJR radio regarding Mrs. Straus. He said both reports were very flattering and well deserved.

On behalf of the State Board of Education, Mr. Ellis offered congratulations to Mrs. Straus on her recognition by the Detroit Urban League.

VII. DISCUSSION AND ACTION REGARDING SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION SELECTION PROCESS

Mrs. Beardmore said at its February 17, 2000, meeting, the Board requested that staff be polled to receive input regarding qualities they feel are important in a Superintendent of Public Instruction. She said the Board has received copies of those responses which she thinks have been very helpful and appreciated.

Mrs. Beardmore said the list of 11 possible search firms was mailed to Board members on March 3, 2000, giving ample opportunity to add firms which may have been omitted. She asked if any Board members wished to make additions or deletions.

Mrs. Gire moved, seconded by Mrs. Straus, that the State Board of Education approve the list of search firms as provided in the memorandum dated March 3, 2000, from Mrs. Beardmore to the Board.

The list is attached as Exhibit A.

Mrs. Beardmore said the search firms will be contacted to submit proposals regarding their search procedures.

The vote was taken on the motion.

Ayes: Beardmore, Gire, McGuire, Moyer, Straus, Warren, Weiser, Wise

The motion carried.

Mrs. Beardmore said the working draft was the result of discussion held at the Committee of the Whole meeting on February 17, 2000, and included the role of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. She said no action was taken on the document, and therefore, it was mailed on March 13, 2000 in a memorandum from Mrs. Beardmore to the Board requesting further input from Board members. She said the strike cap version is a result of that memorandum.

Mrs. Beardmore said the purpose of developing the role of the Superintendent of Public Instruction is to provide a foundation on which search firms may develop proposals, be aware of what is expected of them, and what the position entails. She said the first paragraph is a direct quote from the Michigan Constitution, with the modifications providing additional clarification.

Mr. Warren said the Constitution states that "The state board of education shall appoint a Superintendent of Public Instruction whose term of office shall be determined by the Board. He shall be the chairman of the board without the right to vote, and shall be responsible for the execution of its policies. He shall be the principal executive officer of a state department of education which shall have powers and duties provided by law." He said his suggested modifications were to simply clarify the statement and make it flow better. He said because the Superintendent takes on an advisory role, he feels it was important to include the Governor in that section of the first paragraph.

Mrs. Beardmore said she thinks the last part of that sentence indicates that the Board advises the Legislature on funding.

Mr. Warren said it states that the Board advises the Legislature regarding financial requirements, but his suggestions are designed to explain that the Superintendent would also have contact with the Governor as defined by the State Board of Education.

Mrs. Wise said it is imperative for anyone applying for the position to understand the complexity of Michigan's system, and that the Legislature establishes policy which the Superintendent must carry out.

Mrs. McGuire said because the Governor is a member of the Board, it should be assumed that he has a part in establishing educational policy and funding needs. She said it is, therefore, redundant for him to be listed in the second sentence.

Mrs. Straus suggested that the first sentence should state the Superintendent is hired by the State Board of Education, and the second sentence should be "The Superintendent is responsible for carrying out policies established by the Board." She said the paragraph should also state that the he/she advises the Legislature on education policy as defined by the Board.

Mrs. Beardmore asked if Board members would be more comfortable simply quoting the Constitution directly. Mr. Warren responded by saying the Constitution states "the State Board of Education shall appoint a superintendent." He said he does not think the Board would want to use the term "shall."

Mrs. Straus suggested the phrase "The State Board of Education appoints the superintendent." Mr. Warren said he would be comfortable with that, and added "whose term of office shall be determined by the Board."

Mrs. Straus said she is confident that the Board would be safe in using the language of the Constitution.

Mr. Warren said it would be appropriate to use the first sentence of the Constitution, followed by "The State Board of Education appoints the Superintendent of Public Instruction whose term of office is determined by the Board."

Mrs. Straus agreed that Mr. Warren's language would be acceptable.

Mr. Warren said the paragraph could continue with either the next sentence of the Constitution, "The Superintendent is the principal executive officer of the Michigan Department of Education and has powers and duties as defined by law" or include information regarding the execution of policies, and then the second sentence of the Constitution.

In response to Mrs. Gire, Mr. Warren said it is true that the Superintendent is already identified as the principal executive officer in the first paragraph. He said the last sentence should therefore be

“The Superintendent is responsible for the execution of the policies of the State Board of Education.” He said it could also be noted that he/she has powers and duties as provided by law and is responsible for the execution of the policies of the State Board of Education.

Mrs. Beardmore said she believes that the policy statement should come first because of the Constitution.

Mr. Ellis reminded the Board that the search firm the Board ultimately selects will, more than likely, rewrite this information and present it for Board approval.

Mrs. Beardmore said Mr. Ellis’ point is well taken, and she believes that by quoting clearly from the Constitution in the first paragraph, and describing Michigan’s unique arrangement in the second, the essential points for any person who is offering his/her services for the Superintendent search are identified.

Mrs. Beardmore said the second paragraph in the working draft reads: “In Michigan’s unique governmental structure, the Superintendent is chosen by and responsible to a constitutional state board of education elected at large on a partisan ballot. The governor is an ex officio member of the board without a vote. As the principal executive officer of the Michigan Department of Education, the superintendent also serves as a member of the Governor’s cabinet and state administrative board, and carries out certain acts defined by the Legislature.”

Mrs. Straus said the phrase “as defined by the State Board of Education” is already included in the first paragraph, and it would be redundant to include it in the second paragraph.

Mrs. Beardmore suggested that the sentence in the second paragraph end with “administrative board.”

Mrs. Gire suggested substituting “carries out the law” for “certain acts” because she believes that “certain acts” is not as affirmative as “carries out the law.”

Mrs. Beardmore said changes in the last sentence of that paragraph substitute Michigan’s “chief spokesperson” to a “critical spokesperson in connection with public education.”

Mrs. Straus said she prefers the original wording which indicated that the Superintendent is the spokesperson for public education. She said the new phrase changes that meaning considerably.

Mrs. McGuire suggested “The Superintendent is Michigan’s major spokesperson for public education.”

Mrs. Straus agreed that “major spokesperson for public education” is different from “in connection with public education,” but still prefers the original wording because her view of the Superintendent is as an advocate for public education.

Mr. Warren asked if the Board was in favor of school vouchers, would the Superintendent be acting as an advocate for public education in fulfilling his/her responsibility to carry out policies established by the Board?

Mrs. Straus said the Board is charged with providing leadership and general supervision over all public schools in the state, and since discussion is regarding public education, she thinks that is a critical distinction.

Mr. Warren said he is not entirely comfortable with “chief” because it reminds him of the chief of a tribe. He said the Governor and President of the Board are also spokespersons of education, and it has been made clear that the Superintendent follows the policies of the Board. He said this is the only language which suggests that there is particular connotation to what the superintendent should think independently. He said he believes that the superintendent and the Board are advocates for public education, but it would not be fair to eliminate candidates because they may favor non-public education.

Mrs. Gire said she supports Mrs. Straus’ point of view.

Mr. Ellis cautioned Board members that they were trying to define themselves too much. He said there are many forms of education in Michigan, some of which are covered under statutes and require involvement from the Superintendent and staff. He said public education remains the primary form of education which falls under the auspices of the State Board of Education, and he feels that if vouchers legally existed, they would probably be classified as public vouchers.

Mrs. Wise suggested that the last sentence of the second paragraph state “The Superintendent is a major spokesperson for education.” She said her view of the Board’s role is being responsible for all children in the state in some fashion or another.

Mrs. Gire said she does not believe that the language proposed by Mrs. Straus is limiting the ability to address or deal with other forms of education.

Mrs. McGuire said the Constitution makes reference to public education.

Dr. Moyer said the official title is the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Mr. Warren said the Superintendent also has a variety of statutorily imposed duties regarding non-public schools, and candidates for the position should be made aware of that.

Mrs. Gire said the Board should continue to focus on the role of the Superintendent, not whether he/she will be a spokesperson for public education. She said she cannot envision a Superintendent not being a spokesperson for issues that the Board oversees.

Mr. Warren said it is misleading to indicate that the Superintendent will only address public education.

Mrs. Weiser said the Board's only method of addressing the public role of the Superintendent in the job description is the last sentence of paragraph two. She suggested that the Board not consider it as limiting because she thinks the word spokesperson is being interpreted as advocate. She said it is not an announcement that the candidates are to be an advocate for public education, it is a summary for the role he/she plays when in public.

Mrs. Straus said the Board's original intent for drafting this document was to solicit applications themselves, but now that the decision has been made to utilize a search firm, they will, more than likely, help with the entire process. She said she envisions a Superintendent out in the public advocating for public education.

Mrs. Weiser said the question is whether the Board believes that the Superintendent will be an advocate for public education. She said there are many qualifications that Board members are looking for and have not agreed upon and the search firm will have to spend time determining what they are. She said the new superintendent will need to understand that he/she has a role to play in standing in front of a microphone and attending meetings, and not just to fill an adequacy role.

Mr. Warren said with this exception, everything in the description is either derived from the Constitution or by law, and therefore, this item alone is a matter outside the defined roles. He said the Board may find that they can be satisfied with someone who is a good manager, or a behind-the-scenes type of person, and is not a proficient spokesperson.

Mrs. McGuire said she believes it is important to ensure that the new superintendent is, in fact, the type of person who would be comfortable acting as a spokesperson.

Dr. Moyer agreed and said the Board should not want anything less.

Mrs. Beardmore said the media most likely will direct questions to the superintendent rather than the Board, therefore, she agrees that the superintendent will need to be a major spokesperson.

Mrs. Beardmore asked the Board if they wished the last sentence to read "public education" or simply "education." In response, Mrs. McGuire suggested "The Superintendent is a major spokesperson on educational issues."

Mr. Warren said he believes that is a good solution.

Mrs. Wise said she feels that in the second sentence of paragraph two, where it states that “The Governor is an ex officio member of the Board without a vote,” the “without a vote” is redundant and should be removed.

Mr. Warren said it is possible to be considered ex officio and still have a vote on issues. He said it simply indicates that a specific position is held.

Mrs. Straus suggested that “at large” in paragraph two, sentence one be replaced with “statewide.” She said it does not change the meaning in any way.

Mrs. Weiser said it is grammatically correct to say “without vote” as opposed to “without a vote,” and asked that the document be modified.

Mrs. Beardmore said the third paragraph reads “The Superintendent is the primary liaison to the United States Department of Education and other federal agencies and is the key liaison to other state agencies which have responsibilities for conducting educational programs. A coordinated interagency system works to meet the educational needs of Michigan citizens.”

Mrs. Gire said it was her understanding that Ms. Carol Wolenberg, Deputy Superintendent, Administrative and Support Services, was the liaison in the Department for the “coordinated interagency system.”

Mrs. Beardmore said the Superintendent works on other issues that have a bearing on education. She questioned the word “key” because any department head or person who is involved in the interagency coordination programs can initiate a liaison.

Mr. Ellis said the most recent example of that would be the legislatively directed cooperation with the State Police, Attorney General, and Superintendent of Public Instruction, to develop the safety booklet.

Dr. Moyer suggested “The Superintendent is the primary liaison to the U.S. Department of Education, and other federal agencies, and state agencies which have responsibility for conducting educational programs.”

Mrs. Gire suggested “a coordinated interagency system includes efforts to meet the educational needs,” although it is a misnomer for that interagency group to be defined as working for educational needs.

Mrs. Beardmore said she thinks “educational” is too limiting.

In response to Mrs. Wise, Mrs. Beardmore said the second sentence of the third paragraph is necessary because the Board needs to make it clear to the search firm that the superintendent will not be able to operate independently of other state agencies, but works together in a coordinated fashion which is quite unusual.

Mrs. Wise said it may make more sense to divide the first sentence: “The Superintendent is the primary liaison to the U.S. Department of Education, and other federal agencies. The Superintendent is the liaison to other state agencies that have responsibilities for conducting educational programs.” She further suggested incorporating the second sentence so that the state functions are expanded.

Ms. Wolenberg said the Superintendent is the key liaison to other agencies that have educational programs such as Department of Corrections or the Family Independence Agency. She said the last sentence would have broader parameters with any agency that serves children and families.

Mrs. Wise moved, seconded by Mrs. Gire, that the State Board of Education adopt the Role of the Superintendent of Public Instruction provided in the memorandum dated March 13, 2000, from Mrs. Beardmore to the Board, as modified.

The vote was taken on the motion.

Ayes: Beardmore, Gire, McGuire, Straus, Warren, Weiser, Wise
Nay: Moyer

The motion carried.

The document is attached as Exhibit B.

Mrs. Beardmore said both the Role of the Superintendent, and the Work Statement were drafted in part by the Board at its February 17, 2000, meeting. She said Mrs. Eileen Hamilton, Administrative Secretary to the State Board of Education, distributed the documents to Board members and requested either suggestions for change or notification of agreement that the documents were acceptable as written. She said one Board member suggested modifications.

Mr. Warren expressed concern that the phrase “organizational leaders” in the fourth bullet could be interpreted to include exclusively educational organizational leaders.

Mrs. Beardmore pointed out that it states “network of educational and organizational leaders.”

Mr. Warren suggested that it include non educational organizational leaders or other organizational leaders because the Board has expressed a desire to open the field to business leaders, and military people, etc.

Dr. Moyer suggested “aimed at reaching a broad base of applicants,” in lieu of the capped wording at the end of bullet four.

Mrs. Wise said she would be comfortable with that phrase because she believes it would include, but not identify educational entities.

Mrs. Weiser said when you read the sample proposals provided by some search firms, none of them have experience placing a non traditional candidate in a state superintendent position. She said because there have not been that many positions open in the last five years, the Board must define the wording for the search firms. She said it is imperative to make the Board’s preference clear in either limiting the search to the educational field, or opening it up to non traditional candidates so that it remains satisfied with the process and resulting applicants. She said otherwise, the Board may find that it will have to start the whole process over again four months from now.

Mrs. Straus said she feels that the search should be aimed at reaching a broad base of applicants.

Mr. Warren said if you do not qualify what kind of person you are looking for, and broad base could be construed to mean that you are looking for a lot of educators. He said there is no question that the Board knows what the statement means, but a search firm that has not spent time looking for non traditional candidates, may not have a clear picture of what the Board wants.

Mrs. Gire said she is comfortable with the way it has been re-worded.

Mrs. Beardmore agreed, and said she would not object to inserting the word “other” before organizational leaders in the second line if that makes it more clear.

Mrs. McGuire said she feels that the search firm should supply references and names of people they have placed in different positions.

Mrs. Beardmore said she thinks that point is a little more germane to the questions to consider when hiring a superintendent search firm.

Mrs. Wise agreed the Board should receive that information before hiring a particular search firm.

Mr. Warren moved, seconded by Mrs. Wise, that the State Board of Education adopt the Work Statement attached to the March 13, 2000, memorandum from Mrs. Beardmore, as modified.

The vote was taken on the motion.

Ayes: Beardmore, Gire, McGuire, Moyer, Straus, Warren, Weiser, Wise

The motion carried.

The Work Statement is attached as Exhibit C.

Mrs. Beardmore said as outlined in her memorandum to the Board dated March 3, 2000, Mrs. Hamilton; Mr. Ody Norkin, Office of Purchasing, Department of Management and Budget (DMB); and Mr. Ken Cool, Director, Financial Management and Administrative Services, met recently regarding the superintendent search process. She said DMB has established procedures for executive searches, and Mr. Norkin, whose experience includes securing executive search services for several high level positions, has offered his assistance in helping the Board select a search firm. She said Mr. Norkin suggested that the Board appoint a subcommittee to review the proposals received to at least narrow the field from which the Board may make its final selection.

Mrs. Beardmore said her selections for the subcommittee, if there were consensus to go that route, are: Mrs. Straus, Mr. Warren, Mrs. Gire, and herself. She said she thinks it is important to have a blend of both more experienced and fairly new Board members on the subcommittee.

Mrs. Weiser said hiring the search firm is the single thing that will either slow down or speed up the process at this point. She said she is delighted that Mr. Norkin has so much experience, but wondered how many of the Board members have actually been involved in hiring an executive through a search firm.

Mrs. Beardmore said it is important for the Board to move through this process quickly, and therefore, she feels that a smaller group will be more efficient in reviewing the proposals.

Mrs. Straus said she does not think this process will be completed by the April 13, 2000, meeting, so an additional Board meeting may be necessary.

Mrs. Beardmore said it may be more effective to have a special meeting sometime between the April and May Board meetings.

Mr. Warren said he keeps a busy schedule and is still involved with the School Safety Subcommittee. He said he does not want to be the one slowing down the process.

Mr. Norkin said typically, an executive search entails a Joint Evaluation Committee consisting of three to five people. He said he understands that the Board would like to hire a search firm within 30 to 40 days, but the firms generally make formal presentations or at the very least, conference calls. He said they would rather not do everything in writing in order to have an opportunity for a question and answer session. He said it is reasonable to schedule presentations within 14 days of the date of solicitation so that an award could be granted within 10 days of that time.

In response to Mr. Warren, Mr. Norkin said it is not necessary for every firm submitting a proposal to have an opportunity to give oral presentations. He said the Subcommittee would be charged with reviewing each of the proposals, determining which firms to invite for formal presentations, and make recommendation to the Board for approval. He said he would then take that information to the State Purchasing Director for approval of award.

Mr. Warren asked how much time search firms are generally given for oral presentations. In response, Mr. Norkin said typically, an hour to an hour and a half. He said these companies are also very busy, and he must have some flexibility to accommodate their schedules. He said he believes that presentations could be scheduled 14 to 20 days from the request for solicitations. He said because of the size of this search, it should be able to move quickly, but the Board should expect the search firms to submit only their credentials and a cover letter at this stage in the process.

In response to Mrs. Gire, Mr. Norkin said DMB does not have specific guidelines regarding which companies it will contract with.

In response to Mrs. Straus, Mr. Norkin said the final decision regarding which search firm is selected will be based on subjective evaluation, and will not go automatically to the lowest bidder.

Mrs. McGuire asked if Board members not assigned to the subcommittee would be permitted to attend the selection meetings. In response, Mrs. Beardmore said a quorum of the Board cannot be present because otherwise it will have to be posted in accordance with the Open Meetings Act.

Mrs. Gire said she would like a clarification from Ms. Edith Harsh, Assistant Attorney General in Charge of Education, regarding whether a subcommittee must comply with the Open Meetings Act.

Mrs. Beardmore said Ms. Harsh has given earlier approval to this approach because no action is being taken.

Mrs. Gire said she would still prefer input from Ms. Harsh to ensure that the Board is not violating the Open Meetings Act. She said it would benefit the Board to be as open as possible regarding the superintendent search.

Mrs. Weiser said she would like the Board to consider the advantages of the subcommittee versus a Committee of the Whole for the selection process.

Mrs. Straus said she is somewhat uncomfortable excluding Board members, and if the meeting is going to be posted anyway, it should be open to any Board member who wishes to be involved in the process.

Mr. Norkin said one solution may be a Joint Evaluation Committee which has been utilized for many executive searches, and would neither post a meeting nor worry about compliance with the Open Meetings Act.

Mrs. McGuire said she is comfortable with the subcommittee reviewing the search firms and recommending to the Board which ones to bring in for oral presentations, but she feels that it is imperative that Board members be a part of these presentations. She said she does not want to be excluded from participation.

Mrs. Gire said Mr. Warren has already stated that he has a busy work schedule, and it may be difficult for him to attend an extra Board meeting. She said probably most, if not all, of the Board members want to hear the oral presentations, but it could cause a problem if a quorum of the Board were not possible.

Mrs. Beardmore said Mr. Norkin has stated that she would be able to recommend Board members to serve on the Joint Evaluation Committee. She said the problem is how to act expeditiously without eliminating the involvement of all Board members who wish to participate.

Mrs. Weiser said she shares the same concerns as Mrs. McGuire because the Board's most important function is the hiring and firing of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. She asked if two or three possible meeting dates could be identified by the end of the meeting so that oral presentations could be heard by the entire Board.

In response to Mr. Ellis, Mr. Norkin said DMB recommends that the Joint Evaluation Committee consist of a human resource director from one of the state departments to offer assistance in the human resource issues. Mr. Norkin said because neither the Department of Education nor the Department of Management and Budget are obligated to contract with any one firm, there is a lot of flexibility in hiring executive search firms.

Mrs. Beardmore said she thinks the process that Mrs. Weiser recommended is workable, and gives every Board member the opportunity to be a part of the deliberations and oral presentations. She said the next question would be if there should be Board involvement in the Joint Evaluation Committee to select proposals for oral presentation, or if all submissions would be allowed an opportunity to present to the Board.

Mrs. Gire said she would be willing to give up her appointment on the Subcommittee to Mrs. Weiser, but she thinks it is not unreasonable for the entire Board to listen to all oral presentations.

Mrs. Weiser said it was not her intention to replace anyone on the subcommittee, but she does not want to be on this Board wondering if she should have been.

Mr. Warren said he does not think that every search firm that applies should be given the opportunity to provide oral presentations, and therefore, an elimination process must be established. He said it may be possible to select the presenters at the April 13, 2000 Board meeting.

Mrs. Wise said Mr. Norkin indicated that the Board would be ready to make a cut by the April meeting, and the search firms should be ready to come in and make their presentation the following week.

Mr. Norkin said even though it will be a fairly routine process to eliminate those firms which are not interested in working for the Board, it must be understood that it will take more time for the Board to make this decision than if the State Purchasing Office were allowed to do it. He said given the geographics, a conference call could be placed to Board members who were not able to attend, and the Joint Evaluation Committee could meet by April 13.

Mrs. Weiser said the Board understands that it will take longer, but does not wish to utilize the Joint Evaluation Committee. She said it is necessary to determine dates for a Committee of the Whole meeting so that as many Board members as possible can attend.

Mr. Norkin said the entire Board would need to: (1) read all written proposals, (2) make notes and critiques, and (3) submit them to DMB so that the three highest scoring search firms could be contacted for oral presentations. He said because some vendors may appeal, the documentation from the Committee of the Whole must be furnished so that DMB could defend the award decision.

Mr. Norkin said he has been selected as the Board's buyer and will carry out his duties as directed. He offered assurances that the Board will maintain control over the search firm and can hire or fire whomever they choose.

Mrs. Weiser said the problem is that literally half of the Board feels that a traditional candidate is the correct choice, while the other half would like to explore a more non traditional candidate. She said the issue is that the preliminary documents from search firms do not mention success placement of a non traditional candidate in a position of this level. She said the Board will be asking firms to stretch beyond what they have done to provide a broad candidate pool.

Mrs. Gire expressed concern with the amount of time that has been spent on these two issues alone. She said if many applications are received, and the entire Board is involved, it could take a very long time to make a decision.

In response to Mrs. Weiser, Mr. Norkin said staff at DMB can develop some sort of time table, and Mrs. Hamilton and he can set up a schedule that will satisfy the Board. He reminded the Board that once the request for proposal is posted,

unsolicited firms may respond. He said on the other hand, he is not sure that everyone understands how challenging this mission will be for the executive search firm, and therefore, we need to be up front with the bidders on what the true challenge is.

Mrs. Beardmore said there has been occasion when Board members have been asked to respond to the Administrative Secretary in a timely manner to issues regarding the superintendent search. She said envelopes containing these requests will, from now on, be stamped with "priority" in red ink to alert Board members of the urgency of a reply. She said by opening it and responding when requested, the Board will be able to move along as quickly as possible.

VIII. PRESENTATION ON MICHIGAN MERIT AWARD PROGRAM

Mr. Mark Leyda, Executive Director, Michigan Merit Award Program, provided information, utilizing a slide presentation, and responded to questions from the Board regarding the Michigan Merit Award Program.

Mr. Leyda said the Michigan Merit Award Program was proposed by Governor Engler in January, 1999, and the Merit Award Board which was appointed in December 1999, consists of: Mr. Mark A. Murray, State Treasurer; Ms. Barbara Bolin, Director, Michigan Department of Career Development; Ms. Kathleen S. Barclay, Vice President, Global Human Resources, General Motors Corporation; Mr. Clark Durant, Director, Munder Capital Management; Mr. Isaiah McKinnon, Associate Professor of Education and Human Services, University of Detroit Mercy; Mr. Harold Voorhees, Director, Public Relations, Citizens for Traditional Values; and Mr. Ellis.

Mr. Leyda said the Merit Award Board has held two meetings and has discussed and/or approved the following: (1) Bylaws; (2) Qualifying Results - Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Tests; (3) College Admissions Tests and Qualifying Results; (4) Approved Postsecondary Educational Institutions; (5) Timing of Qualifying Tests; (6) Payment Options; (7) GED Eligibility; (8) Job Skills Test and Qualifying Results; (9) Appeals Process; (10) Eligible Costs; and (11) Clarification of Eligibility.

In response to Mrs. Gire, Mr. Leyda said the Merit Award Act references eligibility by virtue of high school graduation or GED certification. He said the Merit Award Board has issued a resolution to clarify that for school districts.

Mr. Leyda said approximately 500,000 students took the MEAP tests in grades 4, 5, 7, and 8 so far this year, but he is looking forward to a substantial increase in those numbers over the next year or so. He said the Merit Award Board will be interested in finding out what impact the program has on MEAP participation.

Mr. Leyda said there is a bit of scramble going on to accommodate the class of 2000 which graduates in May and June. He said staff have felt obligated to provide as many test opportunities as possible to ensure students who want to qualify for an award to do so. He said students will be notified over the next several months depending on when they took the test. He said in September, 2000, the first payments will be sent directly to the postsecondary institutions that the award winners have selected.

Mr. Leyda said one of the issues that has been problematic as a result of the Merit Award is the increased development of test sites for non-public students. He said the law requires that public schools students be offered the test as well as home schooled students in their district. He said non-public schools do not share that mandate, but the Merit Award Board has the responsibility to offer those tests to all students in Michigan. He said 41 sites have been developed throughout the state so those non-public school students who are interested in qualifying for the Merit Award have that opportunity. He said it is anticipated that those sites will increase over the years. He said 7th graders are eligible for the scholarship this year, but that will be expanded to include 8th graders in the future.

Mrs. Beardmore said the map provided by Mr. Leyda indicates that neither the western Upper Peninsula nor the southern edge of the Lower Peninsula have identified test sites available for non-public students. She asked if they are expected to simply go to the nearest site to take the test. In response, Mr. Leyda said even though it is not stipulated by law, many non-public schools offer the test to their students of their own accord. He said the sites identified on the map provided to the Board are a result of efforts to accommodate those non-public school students whose schools were not offering the test. He said to the best of his knowledge, all non public school students have been offered an opportunity to take the test.

Mr. Leyda said many students are taking the test multiple times, and it is estimated that there will be 31,000 award winners or an estimated \$77,500,000 awarded. He said as difficult as this program has been given the time restraints, staff are very encouraged so far about the opportunities to reward academic achievement.

In response to Mrs. McGuire, Mr. Leyda said a substantial portion of the Merit Award Program is funded by the tobacco settlement which will be distributed over the next several years in varying increments.

Mrs. Gire said since the entire MEAP unit has moved to the Department of Treasury, the Board is curious about what input it will have regarding the changes in setting the cut scores and the administration of the tests.

Mr. Leyda said it has been made abundantly clear by the Governor and State Treasurer that the overall responsibility for education in the state of Michigan lies with the State Board of Education. He said there is no confusion in that regard. He

said the Merit Award Board's role is in assessment and the development and administration of the MEAP tests in accordance with the Board of Education's direction around the content standards.

Mr. Leyda said the law stipulates the release of half of the test questions each year, which creates a fairly significant test development challenge. He said the web site established regarding the MEAP tests substantially demystifies the process, and it is his opinion that the more people know about the MEAP test, the less controversial it will be.

Mrs. Straus said she is not sure if the State Board of Education had approved the release of test questions, but it was definitely heading in that direction. She said an important question for some time has been when do students receive their results and how quickly can it be done. In response, Mr. Leyda said he thinks that is the fundamental challenge. He said there is an extensive amount of time between development and actual scoring of the tests, and he thinks that the success of this program will be measured in the ability to streamline that process.

Mrs. Gire said the law also requires direct feedback to the schools and teachers to ensure student success if not the first time the test was taken, then the second. She asked how that issue was being addressed. Mr. Leyda said he thinks that is part of the time line issue which also entails opportunities for teachers, counselors, and administrators to learn more about the MEAP, feedback, gap analysis, and problem solving planning. He said there are tremendous opportunities for improvement and he thinks that in the end, the value of the MEAP test will be measured on the Unit's ability to do that.

Mrs. Straus said the Board has felt that way for a long time and that communication with all citizens in the state is imperative to convey the importance of the MEAP tests, the connection with the higher education community, and what we want to learn from them.

Mrs. Beardmore said during the many years that the Board was been responsible for the MEAP, there was been an external evaluation of statewide assessments throughout the entire country. She said nationally, the MEAP tests have been praised, but much criticism has been receive locally. She said communication is essential for the public to understand the importance of the MEAP and how it can be used for better education in Michigan. She said she is pleased to learn that the word is getting out.

Mrs. Gire said she has learned recently that some of the High School MEAP Social Studies tests were missing instructions. In response, Mr. Leyda said regrettably it seems that if the test itself does not make the news, this type of incident does and has an effect on the public's view of the MEAP. He said he thinks it is the Merit Award Board's charge to make sure those types of things are kept to the minimum. He said

the process for developing the MEAP test is a lengthy one that involves hundreds or thousands of people throughout the state. He believes it to be a strength of the MEAP test, but the downside is that it is not a particularly elegant process from an administrative viewpoint. He said the challenge is to streamline without cutting out those parts that are invaluable.

In response to Dr. Moyer, Mr. Leyda said the database that has been developed for scoring will include socio and economic demographics. He said those scores are currently being collected, and will be presented to the Board at a later meeting date.

No action was taken on this item.

IX. RECESS

The Board recessed for lunch at 11:55 p.m. and reconvened at 1:00 p.m.

X. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING

- A. Ms. Mary T. Wood, 27533 Santa Ana, Warren, Michigan 48093. Ms. Wood offered comments regarding Conner Creek Academy, Central Michigan University, the State Board of Education oversight responsibilities of public school academies, and Department of Education processes for addressing complaints made against charter schools.

In response to Mrs. Gire, Mr. Ellis said Mr. David Winters, Acting Director, Office of Education Options, Charters and Choices, has recently moved from the Governor's Office to work in the Department of Education, and Ms. Joan May, Supervisor, Public School Academy Program, only returned recently from extended leave, so the Charter School Office is once again, fully staffed.

- B. Ms. Sharon Claytor Peters, President, Michigan's Children, 428 West Lenawee, Lansing, Michigan 48933. Ms. Peters offered comments regarding Michigan's Children.

Mrs. Beardmore said Ms. Peters was asked to present information to the State Board of Education because her views are similar to formal positions taken by the Board regarding early childhood, and early intervention. She said the School Violence Subcommittee is currently working on a document that will indicate the importance of preventing violence, and will share many of the points identified by Ms. Peters. She said the State Board of Education and Michigan's children can be more effective working together rather than separately.

Dr. Moyer commended Ms. Peters and her organization for their efforts, and asked what other agencies and/or organizations they were interfacing with on a regular basis. In response, Ms. Peters said the Michigan Coalition for Children and Families is a coalition of approximately 40 organizations which include: (1) the Michigan Federation for Private Child and Family Agencies; (2) the Children's Charter for the Courts of Michigan; (3) Michigan Council on Crime and Delinquency; (4) the Michigan Partnership to Prevent Gun Violence; and (5) the Association of Children's Mental Health. She said these five organizations have been instrumental in developing the legislative agenda outlined in the "Seven Actions for Michigan to Take to Prevent Childhood Violence and Victimization."

Dr. Moyer said the Michigan Congress of Parents Teachers and Students has a significant interest in the same area, and it may benefit both organizations to collaborate in some manner. He said Parents as Teachers is a significant program in many school districts throughout the state, and it is his wish that the Legislature provide funding as has been done in the state of Missouri.

Ms. Peters said many of the zero to three secondary prevention grants have supported Parents as Teachers in various school districts throughout the state. She said one of the reasons for the program's success is that it allows flexibility in a community. She said even though it might be worthwhile to state that we need a Parents as Teachers program everywhere, the approach that has been taken in collaborating with the Human Services Collaboration has allowed local communities to make decisions regarding creating their programming. She said Legislators and others have suggested that by enhancing the Zero to Three Prevention Fund, the Parents as Teachers program is, in effect, expanded.

In response to Mrs. Gire, Ms. Peters said Infant Support Services and Maternal Support Services (ISSMSS) federal programs are very much prescribed and are important programs for continued support. She said they are funded through the health budget, but the zero to three prevention grants allow them to spread out and reach families that do not fit those criteria and to offer some support potentially through para professionals. She said the ISSMSS requires a certain level of professional credentialing for the home visitations which are sometimes costly. She said most of the time, families can be helped with other approaches because even Parents as Teachers has a home visitation approach, and therefore, the zero to three grants are more flexible in allowing different models to be used.

A copy of the "Seven Actions for Michigan to Take to Prevent Childhood Violence and Victimization" was distributed to the Board.

- C. Mr. Tony Derezinski, Associate Executive Director, Michigan Association of School Boards (MASB), 1001 Centennial Way, Lansing, Michigan 48917. Mr. Derezinski offered comments regarding the Update on Accreditation.

In response to Mr. Jenkins, Mr. Derezhinski said MASB is supporting the concept of the accountability model, and would like to become more involved in the process as well as the implementation of it, even though it is understood that the details have not yet been worked out.

Mr. Jenkins said the Board adopted the framework for policy based accreditation at the May 20, 1999 meeting, and asked if MASB has developed alternatives, changes or modifications to the current process prior to coming before the Board the day Department staff is issuing their final recommendations to the Board. In response, Mr. Derezhinski said a review of the proposal indicates that there are still many details that must be worked out, and MASB is proposing a collaborative effort to assist the State Board of Education.

Dr. Moyer said the whole aspect of accreditation is within PA 25 which requires the State Board of Education to identify schools that are not doing well, and offer assistance so that they may improve. He said that policy has been in effect since 1990, therefore, Mr. Derezhinski's offer of assistance has been legislated for many years.

Mr. Derezhinski said MASB testified prior to both the Detroit Public Schools and Benton Harbor Schools takeovers. He said the argument was made that the state should take advantage of the resources and the laws that have been enacted so takeovers can be prevented in the future. He said the accountability model provides data indicating when schools are in trouble so steps may be taken to prevent failure. He said MASB applauds the Board's efforts, and would like to assist in any way they can to make this program a success.

XI. REPORT ON EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION (4-8 YEAR OLDS)

Ms. Sue Carnell, Director, Office of School Excellence; Dr. Marjorie Kostelnik, Chair, Department of Family and Child Ecology, Michigan State University; Dr. Larry Schweinhart, Chair, Research Division at High/Scope Educational Research Foundation; Ms. Carol Breen, Early Childhood Consultant; Mr. Vince Deur, Producer/Director, Vince Deur Productions; and Dr. Lindy Buch, Supervisor, School Development Unit, provided information, a slide presentation and a video, and responded to questions from the Board regarding early childhood education.

Ms. Carnell said the Board received information at the January 13, 2000, meeting regarding early childhood, 0-3 year old children with the focus on brain development. She said information will be given today regarding 4-8 year-old children, the READY Kits, School Readiness Program, and other pertinent programs.

Dr. Buch said early childhood is a continuum that does not stop at age three, and there are no arbitrary breaks in a child's development, however, staff have presented information to the Board as if there were in order to provide a focus on different points they wanted to make. She said families play an integral part in the continuity of a child's development, and Ms. Sharon Peters, President, Michigan's Children, discussed the zero to three secondary prevention grants which are managed by the Children's Trust Fund.

Dr. Buch said during the past two years, staff have focused on the development of the Reading Plan for Michigan which includes: (1) the Michigan Literacy Progress Profile; and (2) the READY Kit. She said Ms. Breen has been instrumental in these efforts, and coordinated with Mr. Deur on the development of a video which will become part of the READY Kits.

Ms. Breen said when the READY Kits were skill tested, it was felt that a visual element was needed for parents who sometimes lacked the skills necessary to fully utilize the written materials in the kits. She said based on those recommendations, Michigan families were utilized in the filming of the video which was made in cooperation with Mr. Deur, and Vince Deur Productions. She said the parents and children selected are involved with the Parents as Teachers Program of Allegan County as well as the Birth to Three Program in Saginaw County. She said Mr. Josh White, Jr., and Ms. Kitty Donohoe who are Michigan performers were asked to narrate and/or perform, and Ms. Donohoe wrote a song specifically for the video. She said the video emphasizes that a child's development actually begins before birth, and as with the READY Kits, is broken down into three categories: infant, toddler, and preschooler.

Dr. Buch reminded the Board that it is continuity and stability that are important in a child's development. She said it is not enough to just offer programs when children are very young, but that must be continued as they get older as well.

Dr. Buch said national statistics indicate that approximately two thirds to three fourths of four year old children attend a center based preschool program. She said national studies also show that about one fourth of those programs are excellent in that they have a positive impact on a child's development. She said that means that fewer than one fifth of four year old children attend a good or excellent pre school program, and that 10% of preschool programs are so poor that they may actually hinder development.

Dr. Buch said 20,000 of the approximately 135,000 four year old children in Michigan attend a federally funded program. She said almost 22,000 attend a School Readiness Program and more than 3,000 are enrolled in special education and Title I programs. She said that means that at least 45,000 children are in publically funded preschool programs at age four. She said about one half of the children in our state are eligible for some sort of publically funded program according to a definition established by the Board in 1988 for children at risk.

Dr. Buch said 467 school districts and public school academies participate in the School Readiness Program which entails four different funding streams. She said 43% of the funding in the competitive stream goes to Head Start while the rest is distributed to public and private programs. She said a new full day initiative has been developed at \$5 million this year. She said the grant recommendation will be presented to the Superintendent for approval soon, and 23 agencies will receive funding through this program. She said another funding stream is the Evaluation of the Michigan School Readiness Program because it is important to ensure the continuation of programs that contribute to a child's development and school readiness.

Dr. Schweinhart said the development that occurs in early childhood is of critical importance to a child's performance and life long learning habits. He said public schools are responsible for the education of America's children, but have historically focused on ages five to seventeen. He said they have not focused on early childhood so as they assume a broader role with respect to education, they are in uncharted territory. He said the challenge is that the system must adapt and not continue business as usual. He said that is why state boards of education and state policies have become so important to early childhood education. He said many states are taking a leadership role and in doing so are establishing state preschool programs. He said even though variability from state to state is an issue, it is essential that support is provided to teachers who are coming into this new activity, and that states receive feedback on the system so that everybody knows if schools are doing well.

Dr. Schweinhart said High/Scope Educational Research Foundation has been conducting a State Longitudinal Study which is ongoing evaluation of the Michigan School Readiness Program. He said schools have been provided with the tools and training necessary so that they can at least assess the quality of their programs, and allow High/Scope to aggregate the data on a statewide level.

Dr. Schweinhart said High/Scope also focuses on an intensive evaluation at selected sites which entails finding comparison groups, and collecting data by means of systematic observation by trained outside observers. He said first year results have been positive, but staff are concerned because of the carefully controlled background characteristics. He said that was considered when an additional design for subsequent years was developed.

Dr. Schweinhart said most of the scores for the Program Quality Assessment for Michigan's State Preschool Program are well above 4 on a scale of 1 to 5. He said that would indicate that there are many good quality programs. He said it was found that children who participated in Michigan's Preschool Program rated higher in all six areas of observation, which are as follows: (1) Initiative; (2) Social Relations; (3) Creative Representation; (4) Music and Movement; (5) Language and Literacy; and (6) Logic and Mathematics. He said the sample of programs were randomly selected from all over the state, and it was found that they were successful in contributing to children's development.

Dr. Schweinhart said it is imperative to provide feedback to schools, and support to teachers. He said the Office of Early Childhood staffing is stronger than ever, but have not come to grips in how to deal with inservice training to support teachers as they come into this program. He said the goal of the program is to contribute to children's development and readiness to learn.

Dr. Buch said in taking a leadership role, staff will review the early childhood standards to ensure they are inclusive, provide ongoing professional development, address group size and adult/child ratios, curriculum instruction, appropriate assessment of young children, and assure that early childhood programs meet state standards so that high quality programming will be offered that will make a difference for children.

Mrs. Beardmore said at the time those standards were developed approximately ten years ago, the Board made a point of stating that many of them were aligned with the standards of the American Society of Teachers (AST) with a particular date identified for each item because the Board wanted to make sure that people understood the Board was referring to a specific document at that time. She said she would not be surprised to find that the AST has updated its standards since that time, and therefore, it is necessary for Michigan to do likewise. She suggested that staff again cite specific documents and dates as was done before.

Dr. Kostelnik said developmentally appropriate practices are the thread of quality that helps bridge the years from zero through college. She said when she was new to the state, she visited many schools to discuss developmentally appropriate practice with child care or Head Start people, but over the years that has expanded to include Kindergarten through fourth grade teachers as well. She said what had started as an early childhood issue has expanded with the realization of a philosophy for education that college educators must recognize.

Dr. Kostelnik said it is imperative to teach classes differently than the old method of an overhead and three hours of lecture. She said it has been discovered that learners, throughout their life span, have to be approached in three ways. (1) delivery of instruction must match both their age and interest which is age appropriateness; (2) provide methods of instruction that is individualized; and (3) deliver instruction in ways that are socially and culturally appropriate. She said the one size fits all philosophy of the past is no longer functional for learners at any stage.

Dr. Kostelnik conducted an exercise with the Board and guests pertaining to educational development.

Dr. Kostelnik said the group that received the lavender or green sheets during the exercise probably did a little better at remembering the items listed than those who received the white sheets. She said they both contained the same items, but because the lists on the colored sheets were categorized, it was easier to remember. She said her method of delivery made a difference in the outcome. She said if her behavioral

objective was the student will memorize items and be 80% successful, certainly the group in which she delivered the instruction in categories had a better chance of being successful than the group who did not. She said the heart of developmentally appropriate practice is to match the delivery of instruction to how children learn, and children learn in ways that are qualitatively different than adults. She said they are not miniature adults or simply less experienced. She said they see and take in the world in a way that is different from adults, and so it is important to design instruction in ways that match their kind of learning. She said that is developmentally appropriate practice.

Dr. Kostelnik said educators used to think that there was a methodology for very young children, and so when she first came to Michigan there was a large division between pre-school and elementary instruction methods. She said the gap is slowly closing because many educators have noticed that there is a continuum of methodology that starts in early childhood and needs to continue in the elementary grades. She said it is imperative to have a developmentally appropriate practice for all children in Michigan schools.

Dr. Kostelnik said children of about age eight or nine are actually trying to organize their world cognitively in language, socially, and physically. She said that is, in fact, a big milestone of that period of development, and is why the National Association for the Education of Young Children as well as the National State Boards of Education have designated zero to eight as the early childhood period.

A copy of the following documents were distributed to the Board: “Developmentally Inappropriate Practices,” “Empirical Support for Developmentally Appropriate Programs,” “Examples of Appropriate Practices and Inappropriate Practices for Establishing Relationships with Families.”

Dr. Kostelnik said it is important to consider whole child learning, and all aspects of development. She said the core curriculum that the Board has approved can be delivered in a way that is either developmentally appropriate, or not. She said during the earlier exercise, she knew that adults tend to learn best by categories and therefore, those who received the white sheets were less successful than those with the colored sheets. She said her delivery did not match her objective. She said the same process must be done for children to ensure success, but the problem is that some children succeed in an inappropriate circumstance. She said they are able to get over the barriers or they have a learning style that is particularly suited to the delivery method.

Dr. Kostelnik said part of our goal as a state should be to try to integrate the holistic approach to learning a more hands on experience which does not stop in the preschool years.

Dr. Kostelnik said some people believe that it is not developmentally appropriate to

assess a child's learning, but even though a young child would have difficulty sitting and taking a paper and pencil test, the teacher should be able to make observations, keep a portfolio of his or her work, and make a systematic record of that child's progress. She said we want to have assessment that matches how children learn and how they perform. She said parents are also an integral part of the learning process, and so schools should work at developing a partnership with them.

Dr. Kostelnik said developmentally appropriate practices lead to better language, reading, and math skills over time as shown on both informal assessment and standardized tests.

Mrs. Gire said the 4th and 5th grade MEAP tests are paper and pencil tests. She asked if they should perhaps be combined with some other form of assessment. In response, Dr. Kostelnik said the paper and pencil test and especially the group tests for young children are not very appropriate, but children are beginning to understand concrete representations by the 4th and 5th grades. She said it should not be the sole method of assessment because children have different learning styles, and therefore, a combination of strategies is always best.

In response to Mrs. Weiser, Dr. Kostelnik said she did not know how many K-4 classrooms in Michigan are taught in developmentally appropriate ways, and doctoral students have had difficulty locating classrooms to use in their research.

Mr. Schweinhart said the state has a responsibility for the Michigan School Readiness Program that far exceeds and is much more central in its responsibility than K-4. He said there is some unevenness in programming, so much can be said in respect to the program for four year olds, but almost nothing about K-4.

In response to Mr. Warren, Dr. Kostelnik said developmentally appropriate classrooms are sporadic throughout the state because of a combination of conditions which include: (1) teacher training - teacher preparation institutions need to train students in a more integrated comprehensive, hands on fashion; and (2) teachers get a lot of mixed messages - a new trend comes along and teachers are subjected to intensive training. The following year, something new is developed, and training begins again. She said there are many teachers who do not know enough about child development, but rely on their intuitive knowledge. She said a whole generation of people have been trained to be suspicious of book learning, and there are structural barriers in schools like class size. She said the actual problem has to do with the culture of teaching, and the fact is that when you try new methods, you are not considered part of the group. She said if you can move the culture, you get change, but if you cannot move the culture, you do not get change.

Mr. Warren asked what incentives or external influences would force people to change. In response, Dr. Kostelnik said the Board may recommend policy to the local districts, but cannot dictate that they adopt them. She said this is a very complex issue that does not have a single solution.

Dr. Moyer expressed concern regarding the fact that all 4th-grade students in Michigan are expected to read at a 4th grade level. He said everyone develops and learns at a different rate, and therefore, he feels that mandate is an unreasonable expectation.

Mr. Warren said part of the problem may be that instead of cohorts of people grouped together based on their skill level, students are in to grades based on their age.

Dr. Schweinhart said he thinks one of the extraordinary things about schooling in America is how much it relies on policies that have never been proven. He said they were just handed down from one generation to the next.

Mrs. Weiser reminded the Board that reading by the fourth grade is a benchmark, and that a child who cannot read by that time, may have difficulty keeping up as they move through the higher grades. She said she has been through an effort to bring a developmentally appropriate child care center into a district. She said she watched twenty schools look at it, four try it, one reject it within six months, and two others find that pockets of teachers were being ostracized by other teachers when those children went on to the next grade because they were active learners. She said she knows how difficult it is to do inservice training and ask teachers who have a well-developed style to change everything they do because of a new concept. She asked if this philosophy has permeated everything that Michigan State University is doing regarding zero to eight? In response, Dr. Kostelnik said it does permeate what they do, and Mrs. Weiser is correct in that it is hard for people to change. She said there is a large cohort of teachers who have been in their profession for twenty years and have another fifteen to go. She said that makes it challenging, and there is often not enough sustained support available. She said it is imperative to provide both support and feedback on a sustained basis.

Mr. Warren said he feels that the mind set of the local school boards, administrators, and communities is that they were taught a certain way and they made it through the system, so why it is it necessary to change.

Dr. Kostelnik said early childhood professionals have not done a very good job of helping people understand the importance of what they do. She said we are thought of as nice sweet people in a not so important school. She said her students are thought of as being in sand box one, and are not recognized for the intellectual challenge of working with the beginning learner. She said the profession has to do a better job helping people understand the fundamental intellectual challenge of what they do.

Mr. Warren said it appears that what is being suggested is not really prohibited by laws or an existing system, it is simply that the other educators have not chosen to organize their educational process or delivery system in this way. He said there may be union or mental obstacles, but no legal barriers.

Dr. Kostelnik said it is not a law, but we need the leadership of the State Board of Education is needed in order to make a strong statement that it is desirable for Michigan's children, in partnership with Michigan educators, researchers, and citizens throughout the state. She said it is not enough for teacher preparation institutions to push from behind, the Board must also pull from the front and provide that leadership as well.

Mr. Jenkins asked if it is possible for all children to read by the fourth grade at a fourth grade level if they are not clinically disabled in some way, or is that too high of a standard. In response, Dr. Buch said she thinks that if a child does not have a diagnosed disability and is not reading by the 4th grade, the school must look at that situation very carefully. She said if a child is starting a little late, but making a lot of progress, they might not have gotten up to fourth grade level by the fourth grade. She said they are on the right track though, and perhaps those situations should be looked at differently.

Mrs. Beardmore said she thinks that a child's ability to read at grade level by the fourth grade is largely impacted by their experiences in grades one, two, and three as well as early childhood before they even step inside a school building. She said if the Board were to do well with the early childhood and Pre-K material, there would not be a lot of children unable to read by the fourth grade. She said it is not something that the Board will be able to determine as either working or not working after three years based on how many children can read in the fourth grade, but grade retention by the second grade is an excellent case for the importance of those earliest experiences which will, over time, demonstrate the success of education in Michigan for all students.

In response to Mrs. Weiser, Dr. Kostelnik said she would like the Board's leadership role to include a position that would encourage schools in Michigan from Kindergarten through at least fifth grade to be exemplary models of developmentally appropriate practice for all children. She said it may also entail a task force or action committee to help figure out ways to help measure if that it really happening because it is one thing to have position papers and wonderful documents, and quite another for the local districts to implement those philosophies.

Mrs. Weiser asked if there were going to be assessment other than MEAP, which can be a difficult standardized test for children at that age level. In response, Dr. Kostelnik said for children, MEAP would be part of it, but in addition, an assessment in the process of what is actually carried out in the school, and some onsite validation or verification that developmentally appropriate practices were really happening would be needed. She said a recent dissertation revealed that there is a tremendous gap between the stated philosophy and actual instruction, and to narrow that gap would be a tremendous step forward for the state.

Dr. Schweinhart said he is concerned that schools are not spending enough per child

in the Michigan School Readiness Program. He said as he understands the situation, schools received approximately \$6,500 per child as the foundation allowance once they enter first grade. He said prior to that they only receive half that amount which may be because the student only goes for half a day, but if a program is run properly, they have a full time staff who must conduct home visits and have planning time.

In response to Mrs. Weiser, Dr. Schweinhart said the recommendations made by High/Scope to the Legislature are intended to provide guidance regarding improving early childhood education in Michigan. He said if he were to be more programmatic specific, he would say that Michigan is really hurting in infrastructure. He said Ohio has a much better statewide system with respect to regional support, and Michigan would do well to learn from that system.

In response to Mr. Ellis, Dr. Kostelnik said most early childhood educators would agree with her comments on what it takes to be successful. She said they have not figured out how to pay for it yet though, and she thinks that is the bottom line. She said even if funding were not a problem, qualified early childhood teachers are in short supply, and school districts are having difficulty finding them.

Dr. Buch said staff attended a conference recently in Chicago regarding teacher professional development, the teacher shortage, and getting people into the field, but has not received a report from it yet.

In response to Mrs. Wise, Dr. Schweinhart said in order for Michigan to be in line with Ohio's program, it would require a focus on statewide infrastructure support which means establishing a teacher training system for the state. He said the system would resemble the program currently in operation through Head Start, in structure and size, not in detail.

Dr. Kostelnik said Indiana also has an articulated system of training that Michigan currently does not have which means that people who are in two year institutions can move into four year institutions. She said for example, in Michigan, there is a tremendous gap in trying to bridge classes between Lansing Community College, and Michigan State University. She said a benefit of the statewide articulation system is that teachers who graduate from Indiana universities share that philosophy and that it is a much more cohesive system.

Dr. Moyer asked whether studies or information are available regarding the legislatively supported Parents as Teachers Program in Missouri. In response, Dr. Schweinhart said many evaluations have been done, but there is some concern regarding the longitudinal effects. He said it is still a very appealing project, and he thinks there is some evidence of success.

In response to Mrs. McGuire, Dr. Buch said there would currently be little assistance

from the Department if a school district wanted to implement development of an appropriate program. She said staff would refer them primarily to either their intermediate school district or to teacher training institutions. She said this is something new to early childhood, and therefore, staff are not yet able to provide a great amount of support.

Dr. Kostelnik said right now in Michigan, there are simply not enough consultants to go around, and school districts are on their own to find assistance. She said she receives two or three calls per week on the average at the beginning of the year from school districts desperately looking for consultants who can work with them over time. She said they are looking for long term staff who can mentor them along, and Michigan does not have a systematic way of providing that to school districts.

Dr. Buch said Kindergarten provides a lot of phone business for early childhood staff. She said most of the calls are regarding eligibility and whether a child can attend Kindergarten if they are age five on or before December 1, but there are also questions regarding appropriateness, and alternative programs. She said many groups and organizations in the state would like a K-3 endorsement and there are national class size recommendations, but in Michigan, class size is controlled by teacher contracts and is primarily the district's decision resulting in some very large class sizes for Kindergarten.

Dr. Buch said appropriate curriculum and assessment become issues. She said even though the Board has a position on appropriate assessment of young children, and there is much consultation regarding these issues, a systemic effort has not yet been developed.

Dr. Buch said High/Scope has been asked to develop a Kindergarten and primary grade program quality assessment because it is not appropriate to give standardized tests. She said that would allow an assessment where we could observe program quality and then link it to how children have done on appropriate assessment.

Dr. Buch said some of the issues currently being addressed by staff include: (1) initiatives to reduce class size; (2) questions regarding teacher qualifications; and (3) appropriate curriculum assessment and instructional strategies. She said the Michigan Literacy Progress Profile is an assessment tool which leads to appropriate instruction for children. She said because of its success, and teachers have liked it so much, staff are currently considering whether this program could be expanded into other curriculum areas.

Dr. Buch said as a result of the recent Department reorganization early childhood and curriculum staff have been brought together as one unit. She said curriculum consultants are typically secondary people, and so by partnering each early childhood consultant who has a generalized early childhood developmentally appropriate philosophy with one of the content area consultants it is hoped that recommendations

will be developed that would be helpful to schools as they revise standards and offer professional development.

Ms. Carnell said this is an exciting time for the Office of School Excellence because staff feel they are the in the core of education, and are looking to other units for the best practices. She said the Board has heard about quality, training, standards and developmentally appropriate practices which are common threads that it will hear as staff come to the table at each level. She said staff are looking at taking the best practices of systems and processes in and out of Michigan, bringing it together and prescribing that to schools that are failing through the new accountability/ accreditation system. She said curriculum determines what ought to be in the schools, accreditation measures how or if it is there, and then the Department provides learning supports to be able to help schools with the components they are missing.

Ms. Kate McAuliffe, Assistant Superintendent, said the Senate has increased the per pupil amount in the members for the School Readiness Program by \$200 which was more than what was recommended.

No action was taken on this item.

XII. RECESS

The Board recessed at 3:45 p.m. and reconvened at 4:10 p.m.

XIII. RESPONSE TO BOARD INQUIRY REGARDING STATE REQUIREMENTS FOR TEACHER CERTIFICATION TESTING PROGRAM

Mr. Ellis said at the January 2000, Mrs. Gire requested information regarding the requirement that an individual must pass the appropriate teacher test for both a major and minor in order to receive a secondary Provisional certificate. He said staff has prepared a report and is available to respond to questions. He said this issue has been forwarded to the Professional Standards Commission for Teachers for exploration with the request for a response or recommendation for action.

Mrs. Gire said she has read and is satisfied with the response prepared by staff.

No action was taken on this item.

XIV. UPDATE ON EDUCATIONAL LEGISLATION

Ms. Kate McAuliffe, Assistant Superintendent, provided information on the following bills:

<u>Bill Number</u>	<u>Description</u>
HB 4378	Reading Credits: Amends the Revised School Code to require satisfaction of reading credit requirements to obtain a teaching certificate.
HB 5113	Compulsory School Age: Amends the Revised School Code by increasing the compulsory school age from 16 to 18 years.
SB 44	Compulsory School Age: Amends the Revised School Code by increasing the compulsory school age from 16 to 18 years and requires that alternative education programs be provided.

Mrs. Beardmore said she recommends that the Board either take a position in opposition of or recommend that instead of extending mandatory school attendance to an older age, consideration be given to a greater focus on preschool and early childhood. She said the Board has held discussions regarding this issue, and has even taken a position in support of educational and interagency collaboratives for children and their families. She said considering the amount of money that would be involved in extending the compulsory school age to 18, she feels it would be better spent on early childhood and preschool programs. She said this would have a longer term benefit for children and society as a whole.

Mrs. Gire asked if Mrs. Beardmore was suggesting compulsory kindergarten or preschool. In response, Mrs. Beardmore said she would prefer that the Legislature increase funding and programs for young children as opposed to older children who may not have any further interest in schooling.

Mrs. Gire agreed with Mrs. Beardmore and said it may not be practical for the Board to do that in conjunction with this bill. She said many people are making the argument though that by increasing the compulsory school age to 18, students will stay in school and be supervised. She said there is, however, a reason why they drop out. She said she prefers the Senate bill because it requires that alternative education programs be provided.

HB 5351	School District Gift: Amend the Revised School Code to Prescribe procedures for the transfer of a gift from a school district or intermediate school district to a community foundation.
---------	--

In response to Mrs. McGuire, Ms. McAuliffe said this bill would only apply to public schools.

School Vehicles: Amends the Pupil Transportation Act to revise certain vehicle definitions and requirements for receiving or discharging students from school buses.

Ms. McAuliffe also added that both the State Aid Act and the Department of Education Budget were reported out of committee this week on the Senate side, and will be on the floor next week. She said the House has scheduled a series of bills for committee consideration next week, but have not taken up the Benton Harbor bill which has passed in the Senate. She said the House will not schedule a meeting on that bill until next week, but because they will break shortly after that for a couple of weeks, it will be a few weeks before the House looks at the Benton Harbor legislation. She said there was a meeting this week, but apparently the parties will assume unitary status, and therefore, there is no settlement.

In response to Dr. Moyer, Ms. McAuliffe said some additional dollars have been added to the Department's budget. She said there has been an increase in the Board expense line, but details will be provided at a later Board meeting.

Ms. McAuliffe said staff have also met with the Department of Management and Budget regarding the more flexible use of special education funds in Michigan, but no agreement has been reached. She said it is hoped that an agreement can be reached for next year.

XV. REPORT BY SUBCOMMITTEE ON SCHOOL SAFETY AND PREVENTION

Mrs. Gire said Mr. Warren and she are still working on the development of the School Safety and Prevention report, and are not yet ready to present a document to the Board.

Mr. Warren said he has drafted a document that is under review by Mrs. Gire and others, but he hopes to have a finalized document to present to the Board at the April 13, 2000, meeting.

XVI. ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION RECOGNIZING MARCH AS PARENT AWARENESS MONTH

Dr. Moyer said a resolution recognizing March as Parent Awareness Month has been approved by the Board in previous years, and because much of the information received at Board meetings reiterates the importance of parental involvement, he believes that it is imperative to adopt a resolution recognizing March as Parent Awareness Month.

Mrs. Wise moved, seconded by Mrs. Gire, that the State Board of Education

adopt the resolution recognizing March as Parent Awareness Month.

The vote was taken on the motion.

Ayes: Beardmore, Gire, McGuire, Moyer, Warren, Weiser, Wise
Absent: Straus

The motion carried.

The resolution is attached as Exhibit D.

XVII. REPORT OF THE CONSENT AGENDA

Criteria

- H. Approval of Grant Criteria for Personnel Development Activities Under Part B (Special Education) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)

Approvals

- I. Approval of April 2000 as “Project Find” Month in Michigan
- J. Approval of Proposal from Grand Valley State University for a New Geography Program as a Major at the Secondary Level
- K. Approval of Proposal from Grand Valley State University to Convert its Undergraduate and Graduate Level Special Education Teacher Preparation Programs Into K-12 Program Endorsements

Reports

- L. Receive the Report on Financial Status of Michigan Deficit School Districts for 1998-99

Mrs. Wise moved, seconded by Mrs. Beardmore, that the State Board of Education approve the items listed on the consent agenda as follows:

- H. approve the grant criteria and authorize the Superintendent to issue a Request for Proposal for the Personnel Development Project, as identified in Attachment A of the Superintendent’s memorandum dated March 8, 2000;**
- I. approve April as Project Find Month in Michigan, as recommended in the Superintendent’s memorandum dated March 1, 2000;**

- J. approve the proposal for a new Geography program as a major at the secondary level as submitted by Grand Valley State University, as discussed in the Superintendent's memorandum dated March 1, 2000;**
- K. approve the Proposal from Grand Valley State University to Convert is Undergraduate and Graduate Level Special Education Teacher Preparation Programs Into K-12 Program Endorsements, as discussed in the Superintendent's memorandum dated March 1, 2000; and**
- L. receive the report on the financial status of Michigan Deficit School Districts as attached to the Superintendent's memorandum dated March 1, 2000, and authorize transmittal of the report of financial status of Michigan Deficit School Districts to the Legislature to satisfy the deficit reporting requirement of Section 102 of the State School Aid Act.**

The vote was taken on the motion.

Ayes: Beardmore, Gire, McGuire, Moyer, Warren, Weiser, Wise
Absent: Straus

The motion carried.

XVIII. REPORT OF THE SUPERINTENDENT

Reports

- M. Human Resources Report**
- N. Report on Administrative Rule Waivers**
- O. Report on Property Transfers**
- P. Report of Approval of Modifications to the Mason-Lake Intermediate School District Plan for Special Education Programs and Services, 1998-2001**

Grants

- Q. Reading Improvement Assistance Grant**

Mr. Ellis provided an oral report on the following:

- A. Inkster Public Schools**

Mr. Ellis said the Inkster Public Schools Board of Education has entered into an

unofficial contract with the Edison Project to manage their school district. He said this action is the result of many discussions with the Department to resolve the school district's financial problems. He said Mr. Don Weatherspoon, Director, Office of School Safety, has attended every Inkster School Board meeting for the last six months, made the Department's presence known, and encouraged the Inkster Board to focus on a resolution. He said Inkster requested, but was not granted an extension on its deficit problem because it was imperative that they make a decision. He gave credit to Mr. Weatherspoon and other staff in the Department who were instrumental in helping Inkster Schools take care of its financial problems with its own authority and control.

XIX. AWARDS AND RECOGNITIONS

There were no awards and/or recognitions presented at the meeting.

XX. UPDATE ON ACCREDITATION

Due to time constraints, this item was removed from the agenda.

XXI. COMMENTS BY STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEMBERS

A. Blue Ribbon Schools - Mrs. Dorothy Beardmore

Mrs. Beardmore said many school districts have reached a point where all of their elementary schools are Blue Ribbon Schools. She said this designation involves a lengthy and complicated process, and therefore, she feels it may be appropriate that some designation be developed to honor districts which have achieved this level of excellence.

Mrs. Beardmore moved, seconded by Mrs. Gire, that the State Board of Education direct staff to develop a method to honor school districts where all elementary school buildings within that district have achieved Blue Ribbon School status.

The vote was taken on the motion.

**Ayes: Beardmore, Gire, McGuire, Moyer, Warren, Weiser,
Wise**

Absent: Straus

The motion carried.

B. Accreditation - Mrs. Sharon Gire

Mrs. Gire said she recently participated in a National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE) study group regarding social promotion versus

retention. She said she feels it was a very good experience as far as focusing on the issues relating to this subject. She said the study group's task was to develop recommendations for state boards across the country regarding social promotion and retention as well as the related subjects of student success in meeting the standards, and how well states are doing in getting the standards accepted. She said there have been a number of suggestions that she thought warrant consideration by the Board, and would like some discussion and/or specific action to take place at the next meeting especially in light of the accreditation process which is in the developmental phases.

Mrs. Gire expressed concern that by following the route the Board is currently on, there will be a much larger number of school buildings that are not accredited. She said she feels that it is the Board's responsibility to provide what other states are doing in terms of assistance to help the schools move up the ladder, otherwise, the Board is doing a disservice to students. She said an exorbitant number of unaccredited schools would also hurt the image of public education.

Mrs. Gire said one thing that other states have done is create a systematic professional development approach, to make sure that the teachers are up to speed in developing models. She said they also have literally worked down to the grass roots local school building level and developed a plan for building the support for the standards-based movement.

Mrs. Gire said she has spoken with Ms. Sue Carnell, Director, Office of School Excellence regarding North Carolina because they have been successful in building support so their high stakes are accepted. She said North Carolina also has a more direct feedback on the tests so teachers have what they need to help improve student and ultimately the school's performance. She said some districts also provide technical assistance by reviewing test scores and curriculum to determine where gaps may exist, and have suggested textbooks which cover the standards. She pointed out that she is not suggesting that the Board should choose textbooks, but if there were a way to make information available to school districts regarding which textbooks fit the standards best, they may be in better shape.

Mrs. Gire said she would like further discussion from the Board regarding these issues.

Mrs. Wise said she thinks staff would be delighted to provide technical assistance to schools if the funding were available. She said that is an issue that must be addressed by the Legislature.

Mrs. Weiser said she is also participating in a NASBE study group on teacher preparation and certification which has a number of potential ramifications for Michigan. She said she hopes to be able to provide any information or

recommendations to staff on this issue, when it is finalized later in the summer.

XXII. DISCUSSION AND ACTION REGARDING SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION SELECTION PROCESS (continued)

Mrs. Eileen Hamilton, Administrative Secretary to the State Board of Education, said Mr. Ody Norkin, Office of Purchasing, Department of Management and Budget (DMB) had to leave for the day, but she was able to connect with both him and Ms. Edith Harsh, Assistant Attorney General in Charge of Education, regarding the process the Board hopes to be able to use in selecting a search firm. She said Mr. Norkin proposed the following time line: (1) mail invitations to submit proposals Tuesday, March 23; (2) proposals due to DMB by April 7; and (3) distribute proposals to the Board by April 10; (4) Board meeting to review and discuss the proposals, and narrow the field for presentations at the April 13, meeting.

Mr. Warren said it is not reasonable to expect Board members to receive the applications on April 11, and have them read and reviewed by the 13th.

Mrs. Hamilton said the suggested time line is so short because Mr. Norkin knew the Board wished to expedite the process. She said it is typical to give the search firms ten to fourteen days to submit their proposals.

Mrs. Beardmore said the Board should consider the suggested time line.

Mrs. Weiser said it may be necessary for the Board to schedule additional meeting dates to review the applications and narrow the selection.

Mrs. Hamilton said Mr. Norkin was hoping that the Board would be able to narrow the field to three or four search firms at its meeting on April 13, with the intention of inviting those selected to make a formal presentation to the Board at a special meeting.

Mrs. Weiser expressed concern in that a discussion regarding the superintendent search firms would take up too much time at the April meeting, prohibiting the Board from addressing other matters on the agenda. She said she thinks that the Board is trying to rush the process.

Mrs. Wise said when the Board meets regarding the applications from the search firms, it is imperative that it focus on the task at hand. She also suggested that Board members complete evaluation sheets for each of the applications prior to the meeting.

Mr. Warren suggested that Board members select their top three or four choices before a meeting to be held on April 17. He said he still feels that there will not be enough time to properly review the applications because the Board meeting is on Wednesday, April 12, and Thursday, April 13.

Mrs. McGuire suggested an afternoon meeting on April 17.

There was consensus to hold a special meeting on Monday, April 17, 2000, from 1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. to discuss and review proposals submitted by search firms.

Mrs. Hamilton said the Board should choose another date to meet to hear formal presentations from the selected search firms.

Mrs. Weiser said any of the first four days of May would work with her schedule, but she would have to leave by 2:00 p.m. on May 3 because of a prior commitment.

Mrs. Hamilton said depending on where the firms are coming from, it might be easier to have the meeting in the Detroit area, possibly at the airport. She said May 4 is the Teacher of the Year Celebration, and therefore, some Board members would be unavailable for a meeting that day.

There was consensus to schedule a State Board of Education meeting on May 2, 2000, tentatively at 9:00 a.m. to hear formal presentations from the selected search firms.

XXIII. PERSONAL PRIVILEGE - MR. MICHAEL DAVID WARREN, JR.

Mr. Warren said Ms. Brenda Welburn, Executive Director, National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE), addressed the Board at its November 18, 1999, meeting and recommended that it review each meeting regarding what has been accomplished to improve education in Michigan.

Mr. Ellis said the current leadership in the Department has been very effective in allowing staff to focus time, energy, and resources to the tasks set before them by the Board as is evidenced by the presentation regarding early childhood. He said this particular program is progressing tremendously well because staff receives the encouragement they need to be effective. He said the issues addressed today will benefit children, but the results will not be known for many years.

XXIV. TENTATIVE AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

Board members were asked to submit agenda items for the April meeting to the Administrative Secretary. Mr. Ellis said Department staff, the Board President, and Vice President would be meeting within the next couple of weeks to develop and finalize the agenda.

XXV. FUTURE MEETING DATES

- A. April 13, 2000, Berrien County
- B. May 18, 2000
- C. June 22, 2000

D. July 20, 2000

XXVI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Herbert S. Moyer
Secretary